



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/622,024

07/17/2003

Andreas Schroter

56/408

1679

757

7590

03/01/2006

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE

P.O. BOX 10395

CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

SCHINDLER, DAVID M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2862

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/622,024

Applicant(s)

SCHROTER ET AL.

Examiner

David Schindler

Art Unit

2862

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 03 February 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See *Continuation Sheet*. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).


4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 2,3,5-31 and 33-42.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.


EDWARD LEFKOWITZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Continuation of 3. NOTE: With regard to section D. 1. on page 3 of the Remarks, the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant argues that Spies shows in Fig. 5 at most one track of magnetic elements that is arranged laterally next to each of the base bodies 60,70. Applicant argues that while there are magnetic elements arranged interiorly of each base body 60,70, those magnetic elements are arranged on the interior surface of the base body. (see lines 8-12 of page 3 of the Remarks). To this argument, the Examiner notes that the interior magnetic elements appear to be located on recessed tracks. See base body 60 in Figure 5 for example and lines 5-14 of column 5 of Spies. Note the recessed tracks, the magnetic elements, and the concentric rings between the recessed tracks. These recesses causes the magnetic elements to be arranged laterally next to base bodies 60,70. With regard to section D. 2. on page 4-5, the Examiner notes that the newly added claimed features were not previously found in claim 11 or any dependent of claim 11 and therefore the newly added claimed features require further consideration. With regard to section D. 3. on page 5 of the Remarks, the Examiner notes that the newly added claimed features were not previously found in claim 14 or any dependent of claim 14 and therefore the newly added claimed features require further consideration. With regard to section D. 4. on pages 5-6 of the Remarks, the Examiner notes that the newly added claimed features were not previously found in claim 31 or any dependent of claim 31 and therefore the newly added claimed features require further consideration. With regard to section D. 5. on page 6 of the Remarks, the Examiner notes that the newly added claimed features were not previously found in claim 35 or any dependent of claim 35 and therefore the newly added claimed features require further consideration. With regard to section D. 6. on page 7 of the Remarks, the Examiner notes that the newly added claimed features were not previously found in claim 36 or any dependent of claim 36 and therefore the newly added claimed features require further consideration. With regard to Applicant's comment regarding the Kitaori reference at the bottom of page 8 of the Remarks, Applicant is correct is assuming that Kitaori, and not Noriyuki, is the correct reference .